Ham-Policy Digest   Sat, 29 Oct 94   Volume 94 : Issue 511

Today's Topics:
              NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins (3 msgs)
            Spread Spectrum System under automatic control?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 07:53:37 GMT
From: ke4dpx@gregl.slip.iglou.com (Greg Law)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <1994Oct24.205835.11821@news.csuohio.edu> sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)
writes:

>The point is being missed. Are packet bulletins addressed to either
>"all" or a like form of "all" (MUSIC, SEWING, CRAFTS, NAFTA, etc.)
>indeed informational bulletins?

>Is there a difference between:

>1. My tuning in a W1AW transmission and listening to an ARRL bulletin.
>2. My tuning in a packet BBS station and reading an ARRL bulletin.

>I submit that both forms of the bulletin are the same. I end up with
>identical information. In both cases, the bulletin is an
>"informational bulletin". In both cases, the transmission is
>one-way. There is not an exchange between two stations. The form
>that the data takes is irrelevant. The mode upon which the data is

>transferred is again irrelevant.

Playing Devil's advocate here, what's the difference between:

1. Getting on the repeater to announce I-65 is closed at the Brooks exit
because of an accident.
2. Talking to "Joe" on the repeater and telling him I-65 is closed at the
Brooks exit.

It can be argued that the first form is broadcasting and is therefore illegal
per Part 97 of the FCC Rules and Regulations.

For what it's worth, I think most of the packet bulletins are within the rules
and regulations. But there are a lot of messages that are questionable at
best. Quite frankly, I think many people should use common sense before
addressing a message (why send a message to 4SALE@ALLUS or 4SALE@WW when you
know darn well it'll be sold before it makes it across the country, for
example).


```
==========================================================================
73 de Greg   AMPRNet   - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
             AX.25     - ke4dpx@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
             Internet - gregl@iglou.com
==========================================================================
```

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 07:33:06 GMT
From: ke4dpx@gregl.slip.iglou.com (Greg Law)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <Cy3Buq.9s8@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>I think it's always in the benefit of the ARS when a clarification
>of the rules are made in advance to violation notices being handed
>out. All it probably took was for a few to stretch what was considered
>appropriate use of packet for this clarification to be made.

Agreed, and I too appreciate the clarification of the rules prior to the
issuance of NALs. I'm probably risking flamage, but many of the messages
floating around packet BBSs don't have any relevance to amateur radio
whatever and are sent as bulletins (aka broadcasting). What I view as a
problem is the widespread abuse of the system. I see bulletins advertising
amateur equipment for sale. This, in itself, is not a problem. Yet a
large quantity of those messages are sent to ALLUS or, worse, WW. It's gotten
so bad that I don't even bother to read the messages.

>On the back of our license it says, in part, `Operation of the station
>shall be in accordance with Part 97 of the Commission's Rules.' Our
>signature on the front binds us to this statement.

Good words of wisdom, Jeff.

>If someone has a problem with this OO and this clarification, I hear
>that packet might now be in use on the CB frequencies....

>>*** Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all
>>*** that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.
>>*** 73 George K7WWA @ K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

>Boring maybe, but legal!

It's already boring. What little bandwidth we have on 1200 baud
packet is wasted passing bulletins around the country that precious few
actually read.

==
73 de Greg AMPRNet - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
            AX.25   - ke4dpx@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
            Internet - gregl@iglou.com
==

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 13:57:38 GMT
From: Mitch@lexmark.com (Gary Mitchell)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

>>In article <389n39$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com>, rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)
says:
>>
>> [snip]
>>
>>3. The Information sent MUST BE RELATED TO, AND OF INTEREST TO
>>AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS ONLY!

Lets say I have a friend who is a programmer (not a ham) and really interested
in the AX25 protocol (from a technical perspective).   Wouldn't the above
statement rule out amateurs discussing it on the air. The word "ONLY" bugs me.

Thanks Gary, WB9TPG   (Mitch@Lexmark.Com)

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 16:24:44 GMT
From: bad1679@ultb.isc.rit.edu (B.A. Doehner)
Subject: Spread Spectrum System under automatic control?

Hi All,

I have studied the part 97 rules as ammended for spread spectrum
operation in the amateur bands above 420 mhz and didn't see any
explicit prohibition of putting a amateur radio spread spectrum system
under automatic control (as would be practical in a packet radio link).

As long as the system automatically identifies every 10 minutes
and is documented as required by part 97 does anyone see any legal
problems with running a spread spread spectrum under automatic control?

Please reply via email as I don't get this group at work..
Thanks for your comments.

Bernie NU1S/9

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 13:16:40 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<Cy3Buq.9s8@news.Hawaii.Edu> <38k0lg$5jt@kelly.teleport.com>,
<1994Oct26.133813.7352@galileo.cc.rochester.edu>
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Re: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <1994Oct26.133813.7352@galileo.cc.rochester.edu>
rdewan@uhura.cc.rochester.edu (Rajiv Dewan) writes:
>In article <38k0lg$5jt@kelly.teleport.com> genew@teleport.com (Gene Wolford)
writes:
>>Oh, goody. We can all snooze away in compliance.
>>All bow to the mighty ARRL, (Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers).
>>Beware the dreaded "OO"s, (Kilocycle Kops).
>>Heil!
>
>You have clearly missed the whole point of amateur radio in US being
>a self policing hobby. Would you like ham radio turn into the chaos
>of CB?

No one wants that, however you've misinterpred what self policing means.
It does not mean vigilantes or self-important kilocycle cops. It means
that each amateur is supposed to police *himself*, IE voluntary compliance
with good operating practices. Admiral Grace Hopper said it best when

she said, "it's better to beg forgiveness than to ask permission" in
reference to dealing with government bureaucracies. Even the ARRL itself
has often maintained that amateurs should not ask the Commission for
rulings. They almost always prefer to say no since it exposes them to
the least risk. It's better to wait and let them tell you that something
you're doing doesn't suit them. They rarely do, and it gives us much
more flexibility.

I'm not overly concerned about what an FCC staffer said about "bulletins"
being one way transmissions. They obviously are not, and the FCC staffer
likely isn't familiar with the corrupt terminology used by amateurs, so
he didn't understand that the "bulletins" in question are actually third
party traffic passed between amateur stations. This will eventually be
straighened out when the right ear is reached. The FCC has already declared
packet messaging systems to be handling *third party traffic*, so there can
be no question that this traffic is broadcasting. What irritates me about
this whole episode is that a Kilocycle Cop went to the FCC with his ill-
conceived question and thus got an unfavorable ruling that will now have to
be undone.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Thu, 27 Oct 1994 17:43:22 GMT
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<Cy7MvK.Gsx@utnetw.utoledo.edu> <Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com>,
<1994Oct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject: Re: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>I don't think it's illegal, certainly not under 97.113(b). There's
>no hint of material compensation involved. Nor do I think 97.113(c)
>applies since these messages are not broadcasts in the sense meant

My reference was to the updated rules that were published last year.
In these newer rules, compensation is dealt with in 97.113(a)(2).
Part (b) says this:

     97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

(b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of
broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way
communications except as specifically provided in these rules; nor
shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to program
production or newsgathering for broadcasting purposes, except that
communications directly related to the immediate safety of human life
or the protection of property may be provided by amateur stations to
broadcasters for dissemination to the public where no other means of
communication is reasonably available before or at the time of the
event.

>As to wasting resources, 99% of what we do as amateurs could be
>considered wasting resources by that standard. We're certainly
>not going to be able to save up spectrum for later use, once the
>moment is gone, it's gone whether we send anything or not.

True, perhaps, but my time is limited, and if I can't log onto the
local BBS because cookie recipes are being uploaded/downloaded, then I
see it as a waste of resources. I do favor stressing the system, so
that heavy-traffic incidents such as disaster relief can be prepared
for. I'd probably prefer a 10-line cookie recipe over a 200 line
Kep listing, but Keps are of direct interest to the general amateur
community, and as such are not illegal under part 97.

>The subject
>of content of speech is an area where the government should
>tread very carefully, if at all.

Again, this discussion is not about speech content, but one-way
communications.

73,
Dave

--
Dave Bushong
OPEN/image Recognition Products

Date: Thu, 27 Oct 1994 22:35:29 GMT
From: ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV))

References<CyB5vA.9w8@news.Hawaii.Edu> <38nks8$8io@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,
<CyC9v1.KJJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: Questions on this and that

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:

: myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

: >Please cite the section of Part 97 which states that only recognized
: >prosigns may be used.

: You missed the point, Dana. There was nothing in the rules to
: strictly prohibit the use of . ... . / . .   but pink slips
: were given out anyway. The FCC is allowed a broad interpretation
: of their own rules. They felt that the prosign CQ must be used
: to establish a QSO - anything else was prohibited.

I wonder if the FCC felt that it was the transmission of music?

73, Ed

--
Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 14:07:50 GMT
From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)

References<1994Oct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>,
<1994Oct27.220625.12814@ve6mgs.ampr.org>
Subject: Re: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

>dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

>>   (b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of
>>broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way
>>communications except as specifically provided in these rules;

>AX.25 is specifically allowed for in the rules ...

Where?

There is a mention of AX.25 in the section about station control
(97.109(d)), talking about re-transmitting signals unattended above 50
MHz, but I didn't see anything about "one-way communications." Did I
miss that?

73,

Dave

--
Dave Bushong
OPEN/image Recognition Products

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 13:38:26 GMT
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com> <38pcvr$e3h@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>,
<CyD97q.2su@hamnet.wariat.org>
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject: Re: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <CyD97q.2su@hamnet.wariat.org> no8m@hamnet.wariat.org (Steve Wolf NO8M)
writes:
>>|>Again, this discussion is not about speech content, but one-way
>>|>communications.
>>
>>Good, I'm glad you see our point then. The communication is two-way. I
>>send a packet to the PBBS and it sends me an acknowledgement. What is
>>one-way about that? The content may be construed as one-way, but the
>>communication is definitely two-way. That is unless you set up your
>>beacon text to be a 10 line cookie recipe. ;-)
>>
>
>The acks for ax.25 protocol are little more than the op at W1AW looking
>at the power meter and seeing that watts are going into the antenna. The
>acks mean that data is reaching the other BBS. We have no idea where the
>bits go from there. All we have in ax.25 is a remote wattmeter.

No, the acks say more than that. They are the packet equivalent of
QSL. They acknowledge that a transmission has been received *correctly*.
But BBS message passing consists of more than just AX25 acks. There
is a rigid BBS protocol for forwarding *third party traffic* between
these amateur stations. That has to be followed just as good traffic
handling protocols have to be followed on a CW traffic net in order
for the third party messages to be successfully handled. There are
no one-way transmissions involved, nor is there any broadcasting,
as defined in 97.3, involved.

The only thing that differentiates a cookie recipe from a Keplerian
element message or a "Best wishes from the World's Fair" message is
the *content* of the third party message. On that topic, the FCC
says only that the message content must not be commercial, and that
it must not contain the "seven deadly words".

Gary
--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 12:47:25 GMT
From: phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com (Paul H. Bock)

References<38ktrd$6i5@abyss.West.Sun.COM> <phb.783176146@melpar>,
<CyD9Ip.8MF@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: The (1929) Amateur Code

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com (Paul H. Bock) writes:
>>>jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:

>>>>Show me a *commercially* built amateur transmitter/receiver for the
>>>>1929 ham, Rich! Just what do you think was available back then?

>>   A lot more than you are aware of, obviously. While it is true
>>that hams of that era built their own transmitters as a rule,
>   ^^^^^^^^^^^^
>Exactly what I had in mind. That was the *amateur's* code, not the
>SWL's code!

    Well, you didn't exactly *say* that, you said "transmitter/
receiver," which is different. But, in fairness, I knew what you
meant. But let's continue on.....

>>   According to magazine ads of that era, it would also seem that
>>there were many "ready-built" components available which would have
>>simplified construction somewhat.

>But even so, the vast majority had to build what they operated.
>What was out there, in terms of components was quite expensive
>(price the available tubes and compare them to the average
>salary!).

    Well, you're implying that the average ham "manufactured"
his own tubes, which really isn't true. I have a 1924 Radio Amateur's
Handbook (the A. Frederick Collins variety, not ARRL) and it has
schematics, parts lists, and even photos of ham stations from 10
to 100 watts, CW and 'phone. Not a homemade vacuum tube in sight!

Lots of commercial capacitors, tube sockets, and the like. But
the coils were certainly handmade, and all the wiring, the breadboard,
etc. Lot of hand work, to be sure, but probably not much glass
blowing..... :-)

     Regarding salaries, remember that the '20s was a time of
general *affluence* in this country, and the Amateur's Code was
written in 1928; the Depression didn't occur until after the
Crash of '29 (very late '29).

>>>>And even if there was one (which there wasn't), it would have been
>>>>up to the manufacturer, not the ham, to insure it was ``well-built''.

>>   Better read the FCC regs again, Jeff.

>And tell us just what were the regs back then in '28, Paul?

     Well, now, I'd have to research the regs of that era, of course, but
there *were* regs. As a matter of fact, there have been regs ever since
the very first set created in the U.S., the Radio Act of 1912.

     I'll allow as how you were probably referring to that era because you
did use the phrase "would have been up to the manufacturer." However,
my statement till stands; in fact it was *absolutely* true in *that* era
that the manufacturer *was not* responsible for ensuring that his
equipment was "well-built" because there were *no* technical standards
for manufactured equipment as there are now. So, even if a ham of that
era bought manufactured equipment, it would be up to the ham to ensure
that it didn't prevent his station from qualifying as "well-built."

>>It is *never* up to the
>>manufacturer to ensure that a piece of equipment *once installed in
>>a station* complies with the FCC regulations for purity, stability,
>>etc., etc. It is *always* the responsibility of the station

>Paul, we're talking about 1928, for gosh sakes! You need to change
>all your verbs to the past tense, then apply your argument to the
>regs and available equipment of that time.

     I did. See above.

>>If your rig "gets you in trouble" with the FCC you can try filing
>>suit against the manufacturer (lots of luck!) and if it happens

>A wonderful statement for *today's* ham. But there was no `FCC' in
>1928, was there?

     There was a Federal Radio Commission, which examined applicants,

issued licenses, revoked licenses, etc. In 1934, the Communications Act
of 1934 created the FCC and the entire FRC staff just kept right on
with what they were doing, only under a different name.

>>   Read "200 Meters and Down" for a historical perspective on this
>>issue. The problem in those days was that a lot of the wonderful,
>>homebuilt stations Jeff is crowing about had *abominable* signals:

>Yes, by today's standards; but you have failed to put yourself in
>in that time period when the Amateur's Code was written; they made
>do with what they had available. And that is a wonderful book to
>read.

     Well, my point was that Paul Segal wrote the Amateur's Code in
the first place as a means of trying to get amateurs to "clean up"
their act. When I say abominable signals, I also mean operating
practices; rampant BCI, deliberate interference with commercial and
military traffic, etc. It was feared by ARRL that at the next
ITU conference the U.S. delegation might not be so supportive of
amateur radio if these practices continued.

     Don't forget that "quiet hours" *imposed* by the FRC were very
common for hams of that era, and there was a reason: BCI. The FRC
was tired of complaints by the public, and that was the solution. So,
Another focus of the "Amateur's Code" was to get hams to operate
responsibly and try to solve the BCI issue, so the ARRL could argue
that "we are self-policing; we are responsible," and maybe the FRC
would *lift* the "prime time" operating ban.

     So, the Code was a mean of estblishing a well-publicized
"yardstick" of conduct; it wasn't a statement of how great and
wonderful the hams of that era *were*, it was an attempt to correct
deficiencies (and I'm sure the "publicity" aspect was not lost on
the League, especially in dealing with the FRC).

>>>the station licensee. In other words, the ham is always the
>>>the one to insure the station and equipment therein, is
>>>"well-built".

>ready made equipment back then. That's why I still contend that
>`well-built' referred to what the amateur built.

     Well, we have a semantics problem, then, because I believe 9EEA
meant that an amateur station, taken in toto as an entity, should
conform to the best construction practices of the day *regardless
of whether it was all homebuilt, partially commercial, or all
commercial*, and the *amateur* was responsible for seeing that it
was so. I *do not* believe that Segal meant to imply in any way

that an amateur *had* to "build his own" in order to conform to
the Amateur's Code; he simply meant that *however* the amateur
assembled his station, it should be a "professional-quality"
result. And that interpretation would apply just as much today
as it did then, which means that the Amateur's Code is just as
applicable today as then (which I also believe to be true;
especially the "Gentlemenly" part, which seems to have fallen
from favor.....).

>>   One final note: It was in the 'teens that "amateur wireless"
>>began to take on a distictly different character, from "wireless
>>experimenters" to "wireless communicators." In other words, the
etc., etc.

>And this is something today's hams should keep in mind prior to
>bashing the ARRL - if it wasn't for the League amateur radio would
>not have survived to today.

    Well, I'll give you a kudo for that one, Jeff, you're absolutely
correct. In fact, it probably would have disappeared in 1919, or
certainly by 1924, without a focused organization to promote it. And
the lesson for today is.....you may not always *agree* with the League,
but the historical record shows that the League has always acted in
the best interests of *preserving* amateur radio, and sometimes that
has meant compromie. But a compromise that gives you "something" is
often (but not always!) better than a "hard stand" which leaves you
with *nothing* if you lose.

73,

  Paul, K4MSG

(|_|) Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG   Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com
 | |) Principal Systems Engineer Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062

   "You can have my bug when you can pry my cold, dead fingers from
    around it....." - anonymous radiotelegraph operator

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 08:15:53 GMT
From: ke4dpx@gregl.slip.iglou.com (Greg Law)

References<FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com> <Cy6MMI.B56@wang.com>,
<wa2iseCy9pos.D5u@netcom.com>
Subject: Re: NoCal OO , packet BBS that lists posts by "topic"?

In article <wa2iseCy9pos.D5u@netcom.com> wa2ise@netcom.com (Robert Casey) writes:

>Maybe, if someone writes new packet BBS software, they could establish
>"newsgroups". Like maybe: dx, mods, for_sale, wanted, help, recipes,
>images, IBMPC (small 7plus-ed programs, small meaning <20K max), Mac,
>debate (for those gun and such arguements), etc.

>I suppose someone could "simulate" the above now by grouping posts
>by the keyword in the to:<keyword>@<area>, like "images@ww, forsale@usa,
>wanted@nocal, and such. You connect to this new packet BBS, it lists
>all the <keywords> in all the posts that have arrived since last time
>you logged in. Then you tell the BBS which <keyword> "group you
>want to list. Looks a little like a newsgroup.

>Anyone done this?

The KA9Q NOS varients already have this ability except that it truly does
segregate messages into different folders. Private messages to me are put in
my private mailbox while bulletins to FORSALE@anything are in the public
FORSALE mailbox. It really is a better way to handle messages, especially
since most people seem to want to view a small niche of messages. Hopefully
MSYS and F6FBB will add such capabilities in the near future. Frankly,
stuffing all messages in one pen is the pits.

==
73 de Greg AMPRNet - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
            AX.25   - ke4dpx@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
            Internet - gregl@iglou.com
==

Date: 28 Oct 1994 12:34:09 GMT
From: bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon)

References<Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com> <1994Oct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>
Subject: Re: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:
|>
|> >As to wasting resources, 99% of what we do as amateurs could be
|> >considered wasting resources by that standard. We're certainly
|> >not going to be able to save up spectrum for later use, once the
|> >moment is gone, it's gone whether we send anything or not.
|>
|> True, perhaps, but my time is limited, and if I can't log onto the

```
|> local BBS because cookie recipes are being uploaded/downloaded, then I
|> see it as a waste of resources.

Yes, and if I can't log onto the local BBS because ARRL Bulletins or DX BS
is being uploaded/downloaded, then I see it as a waste of time.

So what's your point??

bill   KB3YV

--
Bill Gunshannon         |  de-moc-ra-cy (di mok' ra see) n.  Three wolves
bill@cs.uofs.edu        |  and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.
University of Scranton   |
Scranton, Pennsylvania   |        #include <std.disclaimer.h>


------------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #511
*****************************
```